



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,065	05/26/2006	Yoav Kimchy	06727/0204487-US0	1417
7278 7590 02/24/2009 DARBY & DARBY P.C. P.O. BOX 770 Church Street Station New York, NY 10008-0770				
EXAMINER NGUYEN, HIEN NGOC				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3768				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/24/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/596,065

Applicant(s)

KIMCHY, YOAV

Examiner

HIEN NGUYEN

Art Unit

3768

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05/26/2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 123-155 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 123-155 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05/26/2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-850)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3. Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :08/15/2008; 12/07/2007;07/17/2007;01/17/2007.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 123-125, 128-136, 138-139, 142-143, 144-151 and 155 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kimchy et al. (US 2003/0139661).

Regarding claims 123-125, and 128 Kimchy discloses a capsule, adapted to be swallowed by a subject comprising:

- photon detector to detect radiation; (see [0109-0114], abstract and claim 2).
- a radiopaque oral contrast agent use for marking and identification; (see [0109-0114] and claim 79).
- a control unit for control data and operation; (see [0109-0114] and claim 1);
- a radiation source for transmitting radiation to gastrointestinal tract; (see [0081]).
- the radiation source comprises a radioisotope; (see [0094] and [0354]).

Regarding claim 129-136, Kimchy discloses:

- control unit is capable of analyzing x-ray fluorescence photons generated responsively to the emitted radiation and Compton backscattered photons generated responsively to the emitted radiation; (see abstract, claim 2 and [0081]). Kimchy's device has a nuclear detector and can include a radiation emitter therefore it can detect x-ray fluorescence photons and Compton backscattered photons. Compton scattering are photons created from x-ray when it interact with matter.
- the control unit is capable of adapting to estimate a distance from a site of the capsule to a wall of the GI tract; (see abstract and [0081]).
- the control unit is capable of adapting to estimate the distance by estimating a depth of the contrast agent between the site of the capsule and the wall of the GI tract responsively to the analysis of the Compton backscattered photons; (see abstract and [0049]).
- the radiation source is capable of adapting to emit the radiation from the capsule only a portion of a time that the capsule is in the GI tract; (see abstract and [0081]).
- a sensor is capable of adapting to sense a parameter indicative of possible imminent motion of the capsule in the GI tract, and the radiation source can be adapted to emit the radiation from the capsule responsively to the sensing of the parameter by the sensor; (see abstract and [0081]).

Regarding claims 138 and 139, Kimchy discloses:

- a balloon for inflating around the capsule; (see [0010]).

- photon detector to detecting incoming photons; (see claim 2).

Regarding claims 142 and 143, Kimchy discloses:

- clinically-relevant feature includes a pathological abnormality of the GI tract and the pathological abnormality includes a polyp; (see abstract and [0004]).

Regarding claims 144-151, Kimchy discloses:

- the control unit is capable of adapting to detect that the capsule has reached an area of clinical interest within the GI tract; (see abstract, claim 1 and [0081]).
- the control unit is capable of adapting to withhold the emission of radiation by the radiation source until the capsule has reached the area of clinical interest; (see claim 1 and [0081]).
- the control unit is capable of adapting to withhold the photon detector from detecting photons, and to withhold the control unit from analyzing data, until the capsule has reached the area of clinical interest; (see abstract, claim 1 and [0081]).
- the control unit is capable of adapting to detect that the capsule has reached the area by detecting and analyzing X-ray fluorescence photons; (see abstract, claim 2 and [0081]).
- the capsule is capable of including a pressure sensor and the control unit can be adapted to detect that the capsule has reached the area

responsively to a change in pressure detected by the pressure sensor;
(see [0081]).

- The control unit is capable of adapting to withhold the emission of radiation by the radiation source until the capsule has reached the area of clinical interest; (see abstract, claim 2 and [0081]).
- the control unit is capable of adapting to detect that the capsule has reached the area by detecting and analyzing X-ray fluorescence photons and responsively to the change in pressure; (see abstract, claim 2 and [0081]).

Regarding claim 155, the device in claim 123 disclose by Kimchy performs the method steps in claim 155 therefore it is rejected for the same reason as in claim 123.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 126-127 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimchy et al. (US 2003/0139661) and in view of Sato (EP 0390478 A1 (provided in the IDS)).

Regarding claims 126 and 127 Sato discloses:

- at least one collimator adapted for collimate the radiation emitted by the radiation source or collimate the photons detected by the photon detector for a more accurate detection of the photons; (see abstract and col. 1, lines 1-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kimchy's device with a collimator to collimate radiation or collimate the photons taught by Sato because with a collimator Kimchy's device

can accurately direct the transmission of radiation to the target area and detect the scattering photon with higher efficiency.

4. Claims 137 and 140-141 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimchy et al. (US 2003/0139661) and in view of Gazdzinski (US 2001/0051766).

Kimchy substantially disclose all claim limitations set forth in claim 135. However he does not disclose a shield, and an actuator to move radiation source and the shield so the shield does not block the radiation emitted from the radiation source during the portion of the time. Gazdzinski discloses:

- a shield to block radiation; (see [0238-0240]).
- an actuator configured to close or retract the shield so that the shield can block or allow the radiation emitted from the radiation source; (see [0238-0240]).

It would been obvious to one skill in the art to modify Kimchy's device to include a shield and an actuator that retract the shield taught by Gazdzinski because with a moving shield the system can block radiation from reaching healthy tissue or allow radiation to past from the source to the target treatment.

5. Claims 152-153 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimchy et al. (US 2003/0139661) and in view of Kim et al. (US 6,719,684).

Kimchy substantially discloses all claim limitations set forth in claim 123. However, he does not disclose extending element adapted to maintain the capsule a certain distance from a wall of the GI tract and orient the capsule parallel to a longitudinal axis of the GI tract. Kim discloses:

- extending element adapted for maintaining the capsule a certain distance from a wall of the GI tract and orient the capsule parallel to a longitudinal axis of the GI tract; see Kim col. 4, lines 15-49, col. 5, lines 1-50 and Fig. 1A-2D.

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kimchy's device to have extending element to maintain the capsule a certain distance from a wall of the GI tract and orient the capsule parallel to a longitudinal axis of the GI tract taught by Kim because the extending element allows the capsule to maintain a certain distance from a wall of the GI tract and orient the capsule parallel to a longitudinal axis of the GI.

6. Claim 154 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimchy et al. (US 2003/0139661), in view of Kim et al. (US 6,719,684) and further in view of Park et al. (US 2001/0038831).

Kimchy and Kim substantially disclose all claim limitations set forth in claim 153. However, they do not disclose super absorbent hydrogel that expand when the hydrogel absorbs liquid from the GI tract. Park discloses:

- a super absorbent hydrogel that expand when absorb liquid; (see [0021]).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kimchy's device to include super absorbent hydrogel taught by Park because when the hydrogel absorb liquid from the GI tract it expand and this expansion keep the capsule a certain distance from a wall of the GI tract.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 6,764,440; US 6,632,175; US 6,453,199; US 5,395,366; 2002/0026108.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HIEN NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)270-7031. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on (571)272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 3768

/Long V Le/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3768